# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/718,297 | 11/20/2003 | Timothy Gerrit Deboer | CA920020055US1 | 9784 |

46073          7590          12/24/2008
IBM CORPORATION (VE)
C/O VOLEL EMILE
P. O. BOX 162485
AUSTIN, TX 78716

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| SIKRI, ANISH |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2443 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 12/24/2008 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _18 August 2008_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.     2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-34_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-34_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _20 November 2003_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a

foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year

prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.


Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by

Christfort et al (US Pub 2002/0078168) hereafter known as Christfort.


Consider Claim 29, Christfort disclosed A computer readable media storing

instructions to be executed by a processor of a computer

system (Christfort, [0298]), said processor of the computer system executing an

integrated development environment (IDE) for generating code for executing in a

client-server environment (Christfort, [0080], Christfort discloses an IDE for executing

code), said instructions defining an extensible mechanism for executing said code on a

server that (Christfort, [0081], [0084]), when deployed on said computer system, adapts

said IDE (Christfort, [0080]-[0084]) to: process an input object identifying code for

executing on one of a plurality of servers (Christfort, [0022], Christfort disclosed on

identifying several types of input objects which can be used for coding for the

application) said processing using a view list of at least one input object element

(Christfort, [0022], Christfort discloses on view several input object codes which are

presented to the user), each input object element processing a type of code identified

by the input object to output a deployable object (Christfort, [0022], Christfort discloses

on how the application code is selected by an object on the interface, and the

application code may be executed in a response to a request for a service from an end

user); process the deployable object using a server list of at least one server element to

determine the one of the plurality of servers for

executing the code (Christfort, [0062], Christfort does show the server list for example

containing host servers on a portal page), each server element enabling the deployable

object to execute on a particular server and outputting a launchable object (Christfort,

[0094]-[0095], Christfort disclosed on how objects/created applications are launched via

the system); and process the launchable object using a launcher list of at least one

client element to determine a client for launching the code on the one of the

plurality of servers (Christford, [0093], Christfort indicates on how portal-to-go XML

document or application program containing the code generates the output, and how

the output is launched by the system).

Claim 1, has similar limitations as Claim 29, therefore it is rejected under the same

rational as Claim 1.

Consider Claim 2, Christfort disclosed method of claim 1 wherein

processing the input object to identify the code for executing on the one of

the plurality of servers (Christfort, [0022], Christfort disclosed on identifying several

types of input objects which can be used for coding for the application) includes using a

view list of at least one input element for processing a type of code identified by the

input object (Christfort, [0022], Christfort discloses on view several input object codes

which are presented to the user), processing the generated code includes using a

server list of at least one server element for determining the one of the plurality of

servers (Christford, [0093], Christfort indicates on how portal-to-go XML document or

application program containing the code generates the output, and how the output is

launched by the system), and identifying the one of the plurality of client applications

includes using a launcher list of at least one client element for launching the one of the

plurality of client applications (Christfort, [0062], Christfort does show the server list for

example containing host servers on a portal page).

Consider Claim 3, Christfort disclosed method of claim 2 wherein at least one of the

view list (Christfort, [0022], Christfort discloses on view several input object codes which

are presented to the user), server list (Christfort, [0062], Christfort does show the server

list for example containing host servers on a portal page) and launcher list is extensible

to accommodate additional respective elements (Christford, [0093], Christfort indicates

on how portal-to-go XML document or application program containing the code

generates the output, and how the output is launched by the system).

Claim 4, has similar limitations as Claim 3, therefore it is rejected under the same

rational as Claim 3.

Claim 5, has similar limitations as Claim 3, therefore it is rejected under the same

rational as Claim 3.

Consider Claim 6, Christfort disclosed the method of Claim 1, wherein processing the

input object comprises (Christfort, [0022], Christfort disclosed on identifying several

types of input objects which can be used for coding for the application): analyzing the

input object to determine an input object element for processing the input object

(Christfort, [0080], Christfort discloses on what the input object is); and  processing the

input object using the determined input object element (Christfort, [0086], Christfort

discloses on how the object code is created and developed).

Claim 7, has similar limitations as Claim 6, therefore it is rejected under the same

rational as Claim 6.

Consider Claim 8, Christfort disclosed the method of Claim 1, wherein the

processing the generated code comprises: analyzing a server element for enabling a

deployable object (Christfort, [0087]-[0088], Christfort disclosed on how the portal XML

to go is analyzed); and processing the deployable object using the determined server

element (Christfort, [0093], Christfort disclosed on how the object is deployed with the

aid of the XML document).


Consider Claim 9, Christfort disclosed the method of Claim 8 including

processing user input (Christfort, [0091], Christfort discloses on how user input is

obtained) to determine the server element (Christfort, [0091], [0093]).


Consider Claim 10, Christfort disclosed the method of claim 1 wherein identifying

the one of the plurality of client applications (Christfort, [0095], Christfort disclosed on

which identifying the list of applications available) comprises: analyzing a launchable

object to determine a client element for processing the launchable object (Christfort,

[0094], Christfort disclosed on how the newly created application is launched); and

processing the launchable object using the determined client element (Christfort, [0094]-

[0095]).


Consider Claim 11, Christfort disclosed the method of claim 10, including processing

user input to determine the server element (Christford, [0091]).

Claim 12, has similar limitations as Claim 29, therefore it is rejected under the same

rational as Claim 29.

Claim 13, has similar limitations as Claim 2, therefore it is rejected under the same

rational as Claim 2.

Claim 14, has similar limitations as Claim 3, therefore it is rejected under the same

rational as Claim 3.

Consider Claim 15, Christfort disclosed the extensible mechanism of Claim 12 wherein

said server mechanism comprises a server list of at least one server element

(Christford, [0075]-[0076]), each server element enabling the deployable object to

execute on a particular server and processing the deployable object for outputting a

launchable object (Christford, [0076]).

Claim 16, has similar limitations as Claim 3, therefore it is rejected under the same

rational as Claim 3.

Claim 17, has similar limitations as Claim 10, therefore it is rejected under the same

rational as Claim 10.

Claim 18, has similar limitations as Claim 3, therefore it is rejected under the same

rational as Claim 3.

Consider Claim 19, Christfort disclosed the extensible mechanism of claim 12 wherein

said extensible mechanism is adapted to launch the one of the plurality of client

applications (Christfort, [0095], Christfort disclosed on which identifying the list of

applications available) determined in response to the launchable object for

executing the code on the one of the plurality of servers (Christford, [0093], Christfort

indicates on how portal-to-go XML document or application program containing the

code generates the output, and how the output is launched by the system).

Consider Claim 20, Christfort disclosed extensible mechanism of claim 12 wherein at

least one of said view mechanism, server mechanism, and launcher

mechanism (Christfort, [0022], Christfort discloses on view several input object codes

which are presented to the user) is extensible whereby said view mechanism is

extensible to accommodate a plurality of code types (Christfort, [0022]), said server

mechanism is extensible to accommodate a plurality of servers (Christfort, [0062],

Christfort does show the server list for example containing host servers on a portal

page) and said launcher mechanism is extensible to accommodate a plurality of client

applications (Christfort, [0095]-[0096]).


Consider Claim 21, Christfort disclosed extensible mechanism of claim 12

wherein said view mechanism (Christfort, [0022], Christfort discloses on view several

input object codes which are presented to the user) is adapted to analyze the input

object to determine an input object element for processing the input object and process

the input object using the determined input object element (Christford, [0080]-[0084],

Christford discloses on how the input entered is analyzed and processed by the

system).


Claim 22, has similar limitations as Claim 21, therefore it is rejected under the

same rational as Claim 21.


Claim 23, has similar limitations as Claim 15, therefore it is rejected under the

same rational as Claim 15.

Claim 24, has similar limitations as Claim 23, therefore it is rejected under the

same rational as Claim 23.

Consider Claim 25, Christfort disclosed the extensible mechanism of claim 21 wherein

said launcher mechanism (Christfort, [0094]-[0095]) is adapted to analyze the

launchable object to determine a client element for processing the launchable object

(Christfort, [0091]); and process the launchable object using the determined client

element (Christford, [0090]-[0091]).

Consider Claim 26, Christford disclosed the extensible mechanism of claim 25 wherein

said launcher mechanism is further adapted for processing user input to determine the

server element (Christford, [0091]).

Consider Claim 27, Christfort disclosed extensible mechanism of claim 12 wherein said

extensible mechanism is adapted to be integrated into an integrated development

environment (Christfort, [0080]).

Consider Claim 28, Christfort disclosed a computer program product embodied in a

computer readable medium having instructions that are to be executed by a processor

to have a computer system perform a method in accordance with claim 1 (Christfort,

[0298]).

Consider Claim 30, Christfort disclosed computer readable media (Christfort, [0298]). of

claim 29 wherein said IDE (Christfort, [0080]) is further adapted for modifying at least

one of the view list, server list and launcher list (Christfort, [0084]).

Claim 31, has similar limitations as Claim 30, therefore it is rejected under the same

rational as Claim 30.

Consider Claim 32, Christford disclosed the method of maintaining an extensible

mechanism for executing server side code in a client-server environment comprising:

maintaining at least one of:

a view list of at least one input object element (Christford, [0080], Christford discloses a

list of inputs which are available to the user), each input object

element processing a type of code identified by the input object to output a deployable

object (Christford, [0080]-[0084]) a server list of at least one server element to

determine one of a plurality of servers for executing the code (Christford, [0091],

Christford disclosed on any numbers of servers can be used), each server element

enabling the deployable object to execute on a particular server and outputting a

launchable object (Christford, [0095], Christfort discloses on how a objects are

launched); and a launcher list of at least one client element to determine one of a

plurality of client applications (Christford, [0076]) for launching the code on the one of

the plurality of servers (Christfort, [0062], Christfort does show the server list for

example containing host servers on a portal page).

Consider Claim 33, Christford disclosed the method of claim 32 wherein the step of

maintaining comprises at least one of: generating a respective element; adding a

respective element; configuring a respective element; and deleting a respective element

from at least one of the view list (Christford, [0080], Christford disclosed on how

elements can be entered/modified when being configured to be used in the system),

server list (Christford, [0075]-[0076], [0095] Christford disclosed on which server to be

used), and launcher list (Christford, [0095], gives the option to launch a specific

application).

Consider Claim 34, Christford disclosed the method of claim 32 comprising executing

server code using at least one of the view list, server list and launcher list (Christford,

[0080]).

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

## *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANISH SIKRI whose telephone number is 571-270-1783. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am - 5pm Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tonia Dollinger can be reached on 571-272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Anish Sikri
a.s.

December 18, 2008

/Tonia LM Dollinger/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2443